

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/577,461

Applicant(s)

CHUANG ET AL.

Examiner

José A. Fortuna

Art Unit

1731

All Participants:

(1) José A. Fortuna.

(2) Neal Perotti.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 November 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants' representative to suggest an amendment to claim 1 in order to put the application in condition for allowance. The examiner suggested to include a language that clearly defines the impulse drying of the tissues, i.e., to include that the nip through which the tissue is passed, is formed by a pressing roll and a heated drum, (same language of the other independent claims, claims 12 and 24). Mr. Pierotti agreed with the proposed amendment, see examiners' amendment.